Remarks

The Abstract is objected to under 37 CFR 1.72(b). The Applicant encloses a new Abstract that contains fewer than 150 words. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23 stand objected to. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments with respect to each of those claims. The Applicant has, therefore, amended Claim 13 to recite at least one digital recording in place of "the concerned recording." This renders the claim definite.

Claim 15 has been amended with respect to curing the antecedent basis problem. Also, the Applicant has changed "by cognateness regrouping of" to "connected references to." Thus, Claim 15 now recites the step of specifying connected references to regroup operations from the elementary level of modification to a level of the transaction...." Support for this language may be found in Paragraphs [0013] and [0014]. The Applicant also notes that the operations are connected by references (not represented in the tables) towards the operation's relationships so that one can also trace membership of the execution of an operation of a higher level. Thus, it is possible to reconstitute the membership of the operations, since the elementary level of the events and up to the level of the transactions, while passing by as many levels of invocation necessary for the applications.

The Applicant has amended Claims 17, 18 and 20 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion with respect to the main digital database.

Claim 21 has been amended to substitute - - one or more - - in place of "a."

Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the step further comprises integrating or merging updates carried out on various branches into the framework of a new state inheriting these branches.

Claim 23 has been arranged in a manner similar to that of Claim 22. Withdrawal of the objection of Claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 – 15 and 17 – 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Klein. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's detailed and thorough comments hypothetically applying Klein against those claims. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Klein fails to explicitly and implicitly disclose all of the subject matter recited in those claims.

Claim 13 is directed to a process for constructing an organized digital database in a traceable form. The process includes modification of a main digital database by adding, deleting, or modifying a recording of the main database. That modification includes creation of a digital recording with at least a unique digital identifier for recordings and attributes of the main database; a unique digital identifier for a state corresponding to modification of the main database; elementary values of attributes; and concerned recordings in an internal historical database. The process also includes reading the main database, which includes receiving an original request, transforming the original request to construct a modified request for addressing the internal historical database, and reconstructing the recording or recordings according to the original request and a target state such that the main database comprises at least one table with organized development links between the unique digital identifiers of successive and alternative states of the main database.

Thus, according to Claim 13, a main database may be modified and a digital recording is created to track the original content of the digital database which is added to an internal historical database. A reading operation includes transforming a request to address the internal historical database so that the digital recording may be reconstructed according to the request. Organized development links between states are included in the main database.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the differences of Claims 13 – 15 and 17 – 24 over Klein are actually quite simple. Klein does not disclose a table in the main database that is able to organize the lengths of evolution between the identifiers of the successive and alternative states of the database. This is quite the contrary of the subject matter of Claims 13 – 15 and 17 – 24 that are, in fact, able to do just that.

There is another difference, however. In that regard, Klein does not disclose the Applicant's claimed reading step the ability to intercept an original request to rebuild a modified request of addressing the historical database. In sharp contrast, Klein rebuilds the database according to the criteria defined in the original request. Thus, this is another serious but simple difference of the subject matter of Claims 13 – 15 and 17 – 21. As a consequence, the Applicant respectfully submits that Klein fails to disclose all of the subject matter recited in Claims 13 – 15 and 17 – 24. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the above changes to the claims and remarks be entered into the official file. The Applicant respectfully submits that the changes and remarks place the Application into condition for allowance, but in any event, remove issues for appeal. The changes made to the claims are in direct response to requests made by the Examiner to cure a series of minor objections. The Applicant respectfully submits that these changes raise no new issues and do not require further search.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/nn
(215) 656-3381